

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have reviewed and analyzed the final Office Action dated February 17, 2010, and provide the following remarks and comments in response thereto. Claim 36 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 15 and 31 have been cancelled. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, 14, 16, 18-25, 27-30, and 33-36 will be pending upon entry of the present amendment and accompanying Request for Continued Examination. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, 22-25, 27-29 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boylan, III et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2006/0288366, hereinafter “Boylan”) in view of Clanton, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,745,710, hereinafter “Clanton”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites,

A system, comprising:

memory storing a first object, a second object, and a third object, the second object configured to define an interactive component for display in an interactive electronic programming guide (EPG), the interactive component including localized content and the third object including content information for display in the EPG; and

a processor configured to generate and display the interactive EPG by combining the first object, the second object and the third object, wherein a layout of the interactive EPG is defined by the first object and wherein the first object is selected from a plurality of world objects and each of the plurality of world objects defines a different theme for an EPG layout.

The Office Action alleges that the combination of Boylan and Clanton disclose all of the features of claim 1. *See* Office Action, pp. 2-4. Specifically, the Office Action relies on Clanton to disclose the feature that the first objected is selected from a plurality of world objects and each of the plurality of world objects defines a different theme for an EPG layout. *See* Office Action at p. 3. Applicants respectfully disagree. At most, Clanton discloses a single user interface depicted as a movie studio back lot that shows a plurality of objects, such as an indoor sound stage, a poster wall displaying posters of currently available movies, a film archive, and a blimp. *See* col. 8, ll. 20-32. In other words, Clanton discloses a single theme, a movie studio back lot, with a plurality of objects related to that single theme. Clanton fails to teach or suggest a plurality of

world objects and each of the plurality of world objects defining a different theme for an EPG layout, as recited in claim 1.

Further, claim 1 recites, among other features, “generating and displaying the interactive EPG by combining the first object, the second object and the third object. . . wherein the first object is selected from a plurality of world objects and each of the plurality of world objects defines a different theme for an EPG layout.” While Clanton discloses that touching or selecting an icon on the graphical user interface may bring up an animation, such as a poster, Clanton fails to teach or suggest combining these icons (the alleged first object) with a second object and a third object to create an EPG display, as recited in claim 1. *See* col. 9, ll. 10-44. For at least these reasons, Clanton fails to teach or suggest in the features of claim 1. The addition of Boylan fails to cure the deficiencies of Clanton with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Boylan and Clanton for at least these reasons.

Independent claims 12 and 23 recite substantially similar features to those discussed with respect to claim 1 and are thus allowable over the combination of Boylan and Clanton for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 14-16, 18, 19, 22, 24, 25, 27-29 and 35 depend from claims 1, 12, or 23 and are therefore allowable over the combination of Boylan and Clanton for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

Claims 9, 10, 20, 21, 30, 33, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boylan in view of Clanton, as applied to the corresponding base and intervening claims, and further in view of Finseth, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,906, hereinafter “Finseth”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 9, 10, 20, 21, 30, 33, and 34 depend from claims 1, 12, or 23. As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 12, and 23, the combination of Boylan and Clanton fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1, 12, and 23. The addition of Finseth fails to cure the deficiencies of Boylan and Clanton with respect to claims 1, 12, and 23. Accordingly, claims 9, 10, 20, 21, 30, 33, and 34 are allowable over the combination of Boylan, Clanton, and Finseth for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 12, and 23.

New Claim

Claim 36 has been added. Support for new claim 36 can be found throughout the specification as filed, and specifically in paragraphs [0008], [0009], [0028] and [0029]. Claim 36 depends from claim 1 and is therefore allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1, and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claim 36 recites, “wherein the theme of the EPG layout is based on the content information of the third object.” Clanton discloses a graphical user interface representing a movie studio back lot, which shows a poster wall displaying posters of currently available movies. *See* col. 8, ll. 20-32. Thus, at most, Clanton discloses one user interface, a movie studio back lot, which lists the available movies. Clanton fails to teach or suggest a theme of an EPG layout based on the content information of the third object, as recited in claim 36. Boylan and Finseth fail to cure the deficiencies of Clanton with respect to claim 36. Accordingly, claim 36 is allowable for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3130.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: May 12, 2010

By: /Stephanie L. Knapp/
Stephanie L. Knapp
Registration No. 62,473

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000